30

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR
Writ Petition (Civil) No. 7120 of 2007

PETITIONER : Amrit Lal Gupta son of Late Chunni Lal Gupta, aged about 69 years, occupation-Lawyer and Notary, R/o Pendra Road (Gaurela), Rest House Road, Tahsil Pendra Road, District Bilaspur (CG).

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :
1. State of Chhattisgarh, through Secretary, Law and Legal Affairs Department, Office at DKS Bhawan, Raipur (CG).
2. Deputy Secretary, Law and Legal Affairs Department office at DKS Bhawan, Raipur (CG).
3. District Judge Competent Authority under Notary Rules, District & Sessions Court, Bilaspur (CG).

(WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA)

(SB: Hon'ble Mr. Satish K. Agnihotri, J.)

Present : Shri Viswanath Goswami, Advocate for the petitioner.
Shri Vinay Harit, Deputy Advocate General for the State.

ORAL ORDER
(Passed on this 30th of November, 2007)

1. The petitioner, a practicing Advocate, was appointed as Notary by the State Government initially on 02.02.1984 and continued even after completion of the first appointment, as his appointment was renewed time to time which came to an end on 01.02.2007. Thereafter, the petitioner made an application for renewal of his Notary license on 14.10.2006. The same was rejected by the respondent No. 2 on the grounds stated in communication dated 28.06.2007 (Annexure P/1).

2. Being aggrieved, the petitioner has come to this court seeking quashing of the impugned order dated 28.06.2007 (Annexure P/1), passed by the respondent No. 2, on the grounds that the petitioner was not informed within the prescribed time even though the petitioner made an application for renewal of the license on 14.10.2006, i.e. before his license came to an

(31)

end on 01.02.2007. However, the petitioner further continued to work as Notary up to 07.09.2007, even after rejection of renewal of license, as the impugned order dated 28.06.2007 was communicated to him on 07.09.2007.

3. Be that as it may, the petitioner cannot claim appointment as a matter of right as the petitioner has completed his term of appointment which came to an end on 01.02.2007. Reasons have also been informed to the petitioner, may be after some delay.

4. There is no merit in this case. The petition deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Sanu